



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,883	07/10/2003	Francisco J. Romero	200207858-1	2634
7590 04/30/2007 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P. O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER TO, JENNIFER N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2195	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/616,883	Applicant(s) ROMERO, FRANCISCO J.	
	Examiner Jennifer N. To	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :07/10/2003, 12/13/2004, 01/03/2006, and 01/17/2006.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-33 are presenting for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

4. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention are directed to system claim, but appearing to be comprised of software alone without claiming associated computer hardware required for execution. For example, the claims invention recited a monitoring agent (software module) that manipulated and monitored a plurality of data (application data, resource data, policy data). The following link on the World Wide Web is for the United States Patent And Trademark Office (USPTO) policy on 35 U.S.C. §101.

[<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf>](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/guidelines101_20051026.pdf)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 3, 5, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

a. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:

i. as per claim 3, line 3, it is uncertain whether "the policies" refer performance policies, resource utilization policies, or both.

ii. as per claim 5, lines 1-2, it is not clearly understood what is meant by "the monitoring agent is further to contract a domain grouping one or more of the computers".

iii. as per claim 26, it is failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim (i.e. the limitation "the policy data further includes one or more resource utilization policies" already been addressed in claim 1).

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-5, and 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Srinivasan et al. (hereafter Srinivasan) (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0111725).

9. Srinivasan was cited in IDS filed 12/13/2004.

10. As per claim 1, Srinivasan teaches the invention as claim including a system comprising:

resource data, the resource data including information on a plurality of resources, the resources including a plurality of computers (paragraphs [0024]-[0025]);

application data, the application data including one or more application profiles, each application profile having a performance profile and a resource profile, the resource profile including resource utilization information (abstract; paragraphs [009], [0021], [0033]-[0042]) ;

policy data, the policy data including one or more application performance policies and one or more resource utilization policies (fig. 3; paragraphs [009], [0033]-[0037]); and

a monitoring agent to monitor the application data for compliance with the policy data (abstract, lines 11-13; application scheduler; paragraph [009]).

11. As per claim 2, Srinivasan teaches that wherein at least one of the applications comprises an aggregate application executing on at least two of the computers (paragraph [0021]).

12. As per claim 3, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the monitoring agent is further to perform arbitration within a domain grouping one or more of the computers in response to a violation of one of the policies (paragraphs [0037], [0042]).

13. As per claim 4, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the monitoring agent is further to expand a domain grouping one or more of the computers in response to a policy violation (paragraphs [0025], [0038]).

14. As per claim 5, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the monitoring agent is further to contract a domain grouping one or more of the computers (paragraph [0037]).

15. As per claim 10, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the resource profile further includes resource demand information on the amount of resources an application requires (paragraph [0024]).

16. As per claim 11, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the resource utilization information includes resource consumption information on the amount of resources an application is currently assigned (paragraphs [0029]-[0033]).

17. As per claim 12, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the resource utilization information includes at least one of resource consumption information on the amount of resources an application is currently using, and resource consumption information on

the amount of resources an application has used over a period of time (paragraph [0039]).

18. As per claim 13, Srinivasan teaches that wherein one of the computers is associated with a container to execute one of the applications (paragraph [0037]).

19. As per claim 14, Srinivasan teaches that wherein one of the computers is associated with a plurality of containers, each container to execute one of the applications (paragraph [0037]).

20. As per claim 15, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the policy data further includes one or more container utilization policies, each utilization policy associated with one of the containers (paragraph [0037]).

21. As per claim 16, Srinivasan teaches that wherein at least one of the containers is a partition (paragraph [0037]).

22. As per claim 17, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the monitoring agent is further to resize the partition in response to a violation of one of the policies (paragraph [0038]).

23. As per claim 18, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the partition is a hardware partition (paragraph [0037]).

24. As per claim 19, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the partition is a software-based partition (paragraphs [0037]).

25. As per claim 20, Srinivasan teaches that wherein at least one of the containers is a processor set (paragraph [0037]).

26. As per claim 21, Srinivasan teaches that wherein at least one of the containers is a sub-CPU resource partition (paragraph [0037]).

27. As per claim 22, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the performance information includes response time (paragraph [0040]).

28. As per claim 23, Srinivasan teaches that wherein one or more of the application profiles includes resource allocation information for the associated application (paragraph [0021]).

29. As per claim 24, Srinivasan teaches that wherein one or more of the application profiles further includes instructions for installing the associated application (paragraphs [0043]-[0050]).

30. As per claim 25, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the instructions further include instructions for configuring the associated application (paragraphs [0043]-[0050]).

31. As per claims 26, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the policy data further includes one or more resource utilization policies (fig. 3; paragraphs [009], [0033]-[0037]).

32. As per claim 27, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the performance policies have a relative associated priority (paragraph [0033]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

33. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

34. Claims 6-9, and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan et al. (hereafter Srinivasan) (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0111725), and in view of Stone (U.S. Patent No. 6823382).

35. As per claim 6, Srinivasan teaches the invention as claimed in claim 1. Srinivasan did not specifically teach domain definition data, the domain definition data including information on a plurality of domains, each domain comprising a grouping of one or more computers, one or more of the domains being a cluster.

36. However, Stone teaches domain definition data, the domain definition data including information on a plurality of domains, each domain comprising a grouping of one or more computers, one or more of the domains being a cluster (col. 7, lines 17-27).

37. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Srinivasan and Stone because both of Srinivasan and Stone teaching of monitoring performance of server computers and applications. In addition Stone teaching of domain definition data, the domain definition data including information on a plurality of domains, each domain comprising a grouping of one or more computers, one or more of the domains being a cluster would improved the integrity of Srinivasan's system by providing a system that capable of monitoring and controlling server computers and applications (Stone, col. 1, lines 9-10).

38. As per claim 7, Stone teaches that wherein the cluster comprises a first container executing a set of replicated instances of an application on a first set of nodes and a second container having a second set of nodes (col. 7, lines 17-27).

39. As per claim 8, Stone teaches that wherein the monitoring agent is further to transfer a node from the second container to the first container in response to a violation of one of the policies (col. 9, lines 10-33).

40. As per claim 9, Stone teaches that domain definition data having information on a plurality of domains, each domain comprising a grouping of one or more computers, the domain definition data further including information on the resource utilization of a domain (col. 7, lines 17-36; col. 13, lines 34-45).

41. As per claim 28, Srinivasan teaches the invention substantially as claim including a method comprising:

monitoring application data for compliance with one or more performance policies, the application data including one or more application profiles, each application profile having a performance profile and a resource profile, the resource profile including resource utilization information associated with an application, each application executing in a container, the resources including a plurality of computers; in response to a policy violation, automatically enforcing the policy by expanding a first one of the containers (fig. 3; paragraphs [009], [0021]-[0042]).

42. Srinivasan did not specifically teach that each application executing in a container associated with a domain, each domain including one or more resources.

43. However, Stone teaches that each application executing in a container associated with a domain, each domain including one or more resources (fig. 2; col. 7, lines 17-36; col. 13, lines 34-45, each tier comprise one or more server).

Art Unit: 2195

44. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teaching of Srinivasan and Stone because both of Srinivasan and Stone teaching of monitoring performance of server computers and applications. In addition, Stone teaching of each application executing in a container associated with a domain, each domain including one or more resources would improved the integrity of Srinivasan's system by providing an improved system that capable of monitoring and controlling server computers and applications (Stone, col. 1, lines 9-10).

45. As per claim 29, Srinivasan teaches that wherein the first container comprises a partition and expanding the first container comprises resizing the partition (paragraph [0038]).

46. As per claim 30, Stone teaches that wherein the domain associated with the first container comprises a cluster (fig. 2).

47. As per claim 31, Stone teaches that wherein expanding the first container comprises transferring a node associated with a second container, the second container being in the domain associated with the first container, to the first container (col. 9, lines 10-33).

48. As per claim 32, Stone teaches that in response to a second policy violation, providing a message to a user (col. 5, lines 43-51; col. 8, lines 9-19).

49. As per claim 33, Stone teaches that wherein the message comprises a message that a lower priority policy cannot be met (col. 5, line 59-60; col. 14, line 64 through col. 1, line 16).

Conclusion

50. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


Richter et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0194251), Hartsell et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0065864), and Reichman (U.S. Patent No. 6738813) teach method and system for monitoring performance and resource utilization of server system.

51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jennifer N. To whose telephone number is (571) 272-7212. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 6AM- 3:30 PM, F 6AM- 2:30 PM.

52. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

53. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jennifer N. To
Examiner
Art Unit 2195


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100